



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,889	02/07/2001	Joseph M. Cannon	Cannon 112-102	3320
46900	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
MENDELSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 1500 JOHN F. KENNEDY BLVD., SUITE 405 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102			NGUYEN, KHAI MINH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/777,889

Applicant(s)

CANNON ET AL.

Examiner

Khai M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

The Applicant argues in the remarks/arguments filed on 5/11/2006:

Regarding the Tsukada reference, applicant states that Tsukada does not disclose or even suggest a cordless telephone having a plurality of handsets, with the base unit and plurality of handsets each at a different location.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, the examiner directs the applicant to Tsukada (U.S.Pat-4640987) which clearly discloses or even suggests a cordless telephone having a plurality of handsets, with the base unit and plurality of handsets each at a different location (fig. 4-7, col. 12, lines 3-11, col. 17, lines 12-23, Assuming one unit is in communication with the telephone network line in step 41, and in step 42 that the intercom key of the one unit is actuated, step 43 determines whether or not the other unit answers. If it does answer, this is indicated in step 44 and in step 45 the one unit hangs up. In step 46, the other unit is now in communication with the outside line)

Regarding the Tsukada reference, applicant states that Tsukada does not disclose or even suggest a cordless telephone having at least a first handset and a second handset, with the base unit and the at least first and second handsets being at separate locations, and initiating an intercom connection between a first handset and a second handset.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, the examiner directs the applicant to Tsukada (U.S.Pat-4640987) which clearly discloses or even suggests a cordless telephone having at least a first handset and a second handset, with the base unit and the at least first and second handsets being at separate locations (fig. 4-7, col. 12, lines 3-11, col. 17, lines 12-23, Assuming one unit is in communication with the telephone network line in step 41, and in step 42 that the intercom key of the one unit is actuated, step 43 determines whether or not the other unit answers. If it does answer, this is indicated in step 44 and in step 45 the one unit hangs up. In step 46, the other unit is now in communication with the outside line), and initiating an intercom connection between a first handset and a second handset (col. 4, line 65 to col. 21, line 42)

Regarding the Tsukada reference, applicant states that Tsukada cannot possibly anticipate at least first and second cordless telephone handsets having separate intercom buttons for said base station and each other of said handsets, nor initiation of an intercom communication at one of the first and second handsets, nor an intercom communication permitting voice communication between handsets.

In contrast to applicant's assertions, the examiner directs the applicant to Tsukada (U.S.Pat-4640987) which clearly discloses or even suggests at least first and second cordless telephone handsets having separate intercom buttons for said base station and each other of said handsets (fig. 3-4, intercom key 153, col. 5, line 51 to col. 6, line 4, col. 8, lines 48-67), nor initiation of an intercom communication at one of the first and second handsets, nor an intercom communication permitting voice communication between handsets (col. 4, line 65 to col. 21, line 42).

Khai Nguyen
AUL2617